

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

United States of America

Plaintiff,

v.

Booz Allen Hamilton Holding Corporation, et al.

Defendant.

*

*

*

*

Case No. 1:22-cv-01603-CCB

MOTION FOR ADMISSION PRO HAC VICE

I, Todd Stenerson, am a member in good standing of the bar of this Court. I am moving the admission of Ryan Shores to appear pro hac vice in this case as counsel for Booz Allen Hamilton Inc. and Booz Allen Holding Corp.

We certify that:

1. The proposed admittee is not a member of the Maryland bar and does not maintain any law office in Maryland
2. The proposed admittee is a member in good standing of the bars of the following State Courts and/or United States Courts:

State Court & Date of Admission

U.S. Court & Date of Admission

See Attached.

See Attached.

3. During the twelve months immediately preceding this motion, the proposed admittee has been admitted pro hac vice in this Court 0 time(s).
4. The proposed admittee has never been disbarred, suspended, or denied admission to practice law in any jurisdiction. (NOTE: If the proposed admittee has been disbarred, suspended, or denied admission to practice law in any jurisdiction, then he/she must submit a statement fully explaining all relevant facts.)
5. The proposed admittee is familiar with the Maryland Attorneys' Rules of Professional Conduct, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Evidence, the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, and the Local Rules of this Court, and understands he/she shall be subject to the disciplinary jurisdiction of this Court.

6. The proposed admittee understands admission pro hac vice is for this case only and does not constitute formal admission to the bar of this Court.
7. Either the undersigned movant or _____, is also a member of the bar of this Court in good standing, and will serve as co-counsel in these proceedings.
8. **The \$100.00 fee for admission pro hac vice accompanies this motion.**
9. We hereby certify under penalties of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct.

MOVANT

/s/ Todd Stenerson

Signature

Todd Stenerson (D. MD #14194)

Printed name and bar number

Shearman & Sterling LLP

Office name

401 9th St. NW, Suite 800 Washington, DC 20004

Address

202.508.8000

Telephone number

202.508.8100

Fax Number

todd.stenerson@shearman.com

Email Address

PROPOSED ADMITTEE

(signed by Todd Stenerson
with permission of Ryan
Shores)

/s/ Ryan Shores

Signature

Ryan Shores

Printed name

Shearman & Sterling LLP

Office name

401 9th St. NW, Suite 800 Washington, DC 20004

Address

202.508.8000

Telephone number

202.508.8100

Fax Number

ryan.shores@shearman.com

Email Address

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

MOTION FOR ADMISSION PRO HAC VICE

Ryan Shores

State Or Federal Court	Date Of Admission
VA Bar	11/4/2005
DC Bar	9/15/2006
US Court of Appeals - 4th Cir.	3/14/2007
US Court of Appeals - 6th Cir.	3/3/2008
DC - DC Cir.	4/1/2008
DC - D.D.C.	10/6/2008
US Court of Appeals - 3d Cir.	10/7/2008
US Court of Appeals - Fed. Cir.	4/1/2009
U.S. Supreme Court	8/17/2009
CO - D. CO	8/17/2009
WI - W.D. WI	2/25/2010
WI - E.D. WI	1/27/2012
VA - E.D. VA	8/6/2013
US Court of Appeals - 2d Cir.	8/22/2013
US Court of Appeals - 5th Cir.	9/19/2017
Supreme Court of Illinois	7/18/2018
US Court of Appeals - 9th Cir.	8/16/2019

Background Questionnaire 4

Because of a procedural limitation unrelated to my practice of law, I was denied *pro hac vice* admission to the U.S. Virgin Islands Bar in *Alleyne v. Cruzan Viril, Ltd.*, Super. Ct. Civ. No. 143/2013 (STX). As a matter of first impression, the Supreme Court of the Virgin Islands interpreted its Supreme Court Rule 201(a)(4) to prohibit *pro hac vice* admission to any applicant when that applicant's law firm had appeared in three prior causes of action. The Supreme Court denied my application under this Rule because lawyers from Hunton & Williams LLP had previously appeared in more than three causes of action (as was disclosed in my application). I sought an equitable exception from this procedural rule, but the Supreme Court denied this request. The rule has since changed and I subsequently was admitted to the Virgin Islands Bar.